

AMES HOWARD
TRIBUNE

Circulation 6,486

Front Page
Editor Page
Other Page

To the Editor:

'Misleading Logic'

To the Editor of The Tribune:

On Monday The Tribune reprinted an article from the Editor and Publisher magazine by a Mr. Hobart Franks, advertising director of an Atlanta, Georgia, newspaper. Passing over Mr. Franks' self-righteous defense of advertising media, his political and economic observations contain precisely the sort of slick and misleading logic that has caused the public to be suspicious of gentlemen of his profession.

Aside from his defense of advertising, Franks evidently has only two points to make. The first deals with the political position of Senator John F. Kennedy that we should expand the public sector of our economy at the expense of the private sector. Franks labels this a "classic and complete example" of socialism.

'Simply Wrong'

In this Franks is simply wrong. Socialism, whether he likes the definition or not, is the government ownership of the means of production. Neither of the two major parties is advocating that we nationalize the steel industry, or the television industry, or what-not. Words do have meanings, after all, and advertising directors would be well-advised to use them properly.

Franks' second point which is rather disconcertingly inconsistent with his first seems to be that we cannot in any case reallocate resources from the private to the public economics. "What kind of impractical and theoretical paper work is this," he asks, "which transfers money not spent on an individual purchase into money available for public welfare? If I don't buy a cigar does that saving go toward someone's education or our age?"

The answer Mr. Franks intends is no, but the correct answer is yes. When Mr. Franks goes without his cigar

he has taxed the money away from him in order to build schools, he is clearly paying for "someone's education." No amount of bombast will alter this obvious fact.

Rather than engage in the sort of weighty nonsense that Mr. Franks seems to favor, the American people might do well to consider the critical nature of the forthcoming election. According to a recent study done by the Central Intelligence Agency and released by the Joint Economic Committee of the United States Congress, between 1950 and 1959 industrial production in the U.S. increased by 41 per cent. During the same period industrial production in the U.S.S.R. went up 120 per cent, and in the Peoples Republic of China industrial production in the U.S.S.R. went up by 119 per cent. CIA estimated that between 1959 and 1965 industrial production in the U.S. will rise by 30 per cent; in the U.S.S.R. by 68 per cent; in communist China by 119 per cent.

Better Performance

If we are to maintain the strength of the western alliance, our economic performance in the future must be far better than in the past. This is the challenge that confronts America. It will not be met by more advertising; it will only be met by greater sacrifices — going without consumer goods in order to build our industrial plant.

If we cannot pay scholars as much as football players; if we cannot give up tall fins for decent highways; if we cannot go without TV spectacles in order to help the peoples of South America, Asia and Africa achieve some measure of the good life; if, in fine, we cannot or will not rise to meet this challenge, then Khrushchev is right: he will bury us.

Sincerely yours,
Dudley G. Luckett
22 Hilltop Road

FOIAb3b

CPYRIGHT

CPYRIGHT